







# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/003,011	11/01/2001	Roy K. Greenberg	PA-5270-RFB	3255	
7590 02/18/2004			EXAMINER		
Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione			PHILOGENE, PEDRO		
P.O. Box 10395 Chicago, IL 60			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
2 80, 12 0			3732	12	
			DATE MAILED: 02/18/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

CS	

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		10/003,011	GREENBERG ET	AI				
		Examiner	Art Unit					
	•	P dro Philogene	3732					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication			dress				
Period fo		··· <b></b>						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	1 29 December 2003.						
3)								
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	<ul> <li>✓ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>✓ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.</li> </ul>							
Applicati	ion Papers							
10)	The specification is objected to by the Ex The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[ Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by	☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to lead to the drawing(s) be held in abeyan correction is required if the drawing(	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CF					
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>								
Attachmen	t(s)							
	te of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date					
3) Infor	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO er No(s)/Mail Date	```'	nformal Patent Application (PTO	)-152)				

Art Unit: 3732

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1,4,5,6, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Neuss Malte (DE 4,115,136).

With respect to claim 1, Malte discloses a medical grasping device comprising: an elongate control member (1) having an atraumatic distal tip section and a proximal end portion; as best seen in Fig.4, the elongate control member further including a grasping portion (4) proximal the distal tip section; an outer sheath (9) with a passageway therethrough, as best seen in FIG.4, surrounding the elongate control member and relatively movable with respect thereto; and a control assembly (10,11,12) disposed at a proximal end of the outer sheath and the proximal end portion of the elongate control member; as best seen in FIG.4, and in operative relation thereto for urging the grasping portion from a distal end of the outer sheath and retraction thereinto; as best seen in FIG.4.

With respect to claims 4-6, Malte discloses all the limitations, as best seen in FIGS 1-8.

Application/Control Number: 10/003,011

Art Unit: 3732

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2,3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neuss Malte (DE 4,115,136) in view of Fearnot et al. (472,368).

With respect to claims 2,3, it noted that Malte did not teach of a an elongated control member defining a lumen extending through into which a guide wire is receivable and movable with respect therethrough; as claimed by applicant. However, in a similar art, Fearnot et al evidence the use of a an elongated member defining a lumen into which a guide wire is receivable and movable to facilitate the insertion of the shaft and grasping device.

Therefore, given the teaching of Fearnot et al., it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Malte, as taught by Fearnot et al to provide an elongate member with a guide wire to facilitate insertion of the shaft and the grasping device

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neuss Malte (DE 4.115,136) in view of Avellanet (6,264,664).

With respect to claim 7, it is noted that Malte teaches all the limitations, except for a connecting block affixed to the control member disposed in a longitudinal slot; as claimed by applicant. However, in a similar art, Avellanet evidences the use of a

Application/Control Number: 10/003,011 Page 4

Art Unit: 3732

connecting block disposed in a slot to move the grasping device in and out of the sheath.

Therefore, given the teaching of Avellanet, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the connecting block and the slot in the device of Avellanet with the control assembly of the device of Malte to facilitate the in and out of the grasping device within the sheath.

Claims 8-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neuss Malte (DE 4,115,136) in view of Hillstead (5,098,440).

With respect to claims 8-21, it is noted that Malte teaches all the limitations, *l.*except for wire loops that are substantially circular upon full deployment, as claimed by applicant. However, in a similar art, Hillstead evidences the use of wire loops that are circular upon full deployment and having side sections that overlap and touch the vessel wall to engage the object to be retrieved with a greater force.

Therefore, given the teaching of Hillstead, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to incorporate the design of the grasping device of Hillstead in the grasping device of Malte to engage the object to be retrieved with a greater force.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neuss Malte (DE 4,115,136) in view of Fearnot et al. (472,368) in view of Hillstead (5,098,440).

With respect to claim 22, the above combination of references teaches all the limitations, as set forth above.

### Response to Amendment

Application/Control Number: 10/003,011 Page 5

Art Unit: 3732

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are most in view of this new rejection.

#### Conclusion

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pedro Philogene whose telephone number is (703) 308-2252. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin P Shaver can be reached on (703) 308-2582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PEDRO PHILOGENE PRIMARY EXCAMINER

Pedro Philogene February 16,2004